

REMARKS

1. **35 U.S.C. § 112.** The Examiner has rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being arranged in wrong order of steps. The Examiner stated
5 that the step of "transparently disconnecting from said session... calling said telephone number" in claim 2 lines 3-4 must follow the step of "converting said telephone number to an iconic representation" in claim 1, line 6." The Examiner also stated that "the step of claim 2 lines 3-4 can not be included in the recognizing step of claim 1. Because at the recognizing step, the telephone icon (has) not been
10 formed yet".

Applicant has therefore amended Claim 2, to more correctly point out and distinctly claim method steps which properly follow the method steps cited in Claim 1, wherein, the method further comprises the steps of:

15 "transparently disconnecting from said communication session upon selection of said iconic representation of said recognized telephone number; and
automatically dialing said selected recognized telephone number to initiate a telephone phone call session."

20 Support is found in the Application as filed, in Figure 3, and in the Specification, page 8, line 28 to page 9, line 2.

25 Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Claim 2, as amended, overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 set forth in this Office Action.

2-4. 35 U.S.C. § 103. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 4, 7 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff (U.S. Patent No. 5,822,539).

30 **3a.** The Examiner stated that, as per claims 1,4,7, and 10-11, "Van Hoff teaches a method for identifying a pattern within an electronic document during a communication session. The method comprises the steps of:
35 parsing the electronic document;
recognizing a pattern; and
converting the pattern to an iconic representation."

As stated in Van Hoff, in col. 2, lines 35-38:

5 OreO performs "filtering by parsing all requested documents looking for occurrences of certain key phrases or patterns then deleting or replacing those key phrases or patterns".

Also, as stated in Van Hoff, in col. 5, lines 37-50:

10 "Each cross-reference field 194 identifies the unique location of a cross reference document, and each match pattern 195 defines a character pattern (including symbols, words, patterns, numbers and the like). If the character pattern is found in a requested document, that indicates that an annotation linking the portion of the document associated with the matching pattern to the
15 paired cross reference source should be added to the requested document. For example, if match pattern 3 in annotation directory 191 is the phrase "JAVA!" and the paired cross reference source 3 is SUN.COM.JAVAINFO, then a hyperlink annotation "<link to SUN.COM.JAVAINFO>" will be added to the requested document in association with the "JAVA!" phase pattern."

20 Applicant therefore submits that the process disclosed by Van Hoff merely adds a "hyperlink annotation" requested document in association with the "JAVA!" phase pattern. While a hyperlink is added, the link is an **internal** link within the web browser itself. Support can be seen in Col. 2, lines 7-14, wherein:

25 "It is the goal of the present invention to provide a system and method for automatically annotating a received document so as to interconnect that document via HYPERTEXT LINKS to a set of documents known to contain supplemental information related to the topic of the received document.

30 It is another goal of the present invention that the annotation system and method would be implemented in a manner that is compatible with existing Web browsers and the HTTP".

35 Applicant therefore submits that Van Hoff clearly discloses a method which is internally "compatible with existing Web browsers and the HTTP". Such

conventional compatibility with Web browsers is discussed in the Application as filed, on page 2, lines 9-24, wherein:

5 "information on a Web page must have the requisite HTML tags to be an active link.

Web pages often contain additional information such as telephone numbers. These phone numbers appear as informational numbers, for example, for customer service, marketing materials, further information, or for advertising...

10 However, these phone numbers are provided on the Web as text. HTML cannot be used to dial a telephone number over the Internet. Rather, the user must first search the text to locate a phone number. This search may be by visual inspection or by using a search engine to find a particular reference and its associated phone number. To access a number, the user must
15 manually dial the number, or manually input the number into an automatic dialing program."

Similar support can be found in the Application as filed, on page 2, lines 12-24. Applicant submits, therefore, that the "annotation linking the portion of the document 20 associated with the matching pattern to the paired cross reference source", as disclosed by Van Hoff, is clearly a link between compatible documents within the data session (the Web Browser).

Recognition of Telephone Numbers. The Examiner admitted that "Van Hoff 25 does not explicitly teach recognizing a telephone number and converting the telephone number to an iconic representation". However, the Examiner stated that "Van Hoff teaches recognizing a pattern which can be characters or numbers (col. 5, lines 37-50). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the telephone number as the pattern 30 taught by Van Hoff because the telephone number is a set of numbers".

Applicant disagrees that the recognition of a telephone number, and the subsequent conversion of a telephone number to an iconic representation would be obvious, based upon the teachings of Van Hoff. As disclosed in the Application as filed, on 35 page 3, lines 20-23, and in page 6, lines 1-4:

"A parsing algorithm applied to the text in the HTML document pattern-recognizes telephone numbers having a standard format, such as United States numbers or international phone numbers."

5 Applicant submits that telephone numbers are not simply a "set of numbers", as stated by the Examiner, but may be displayed in a number of formats. Further support is seen in the Application, as filed, page 7, line 19 to page 8, line 15, wherein:

10 Telephone numbers can include text, such as hyphens or parentheses, or spaces interspersed with numbers. The patterns in the Picture Formats are therefore defined by those text characters that can be before and in between numbers. Because some text characters void the pattern, the algorithm should take this into account (230). Thus, the algorithm can distinguish, for
15 example, among parentheses surrounding an area code, parentheses surrounding a sentence, and a serial number containing both numbers and text characters.

20 The patterns in the Picture Formats are also defined by the length of the number string. For example, U.S. area codes are usually three digits, and prefixes are usually three digits, followed by four final digits.

The following is an example of an algorithm that supports U.S. phone numbers. The algorithm looks for the following patterns:

25 'xxx*xxxx';

 'x*xxx*xxxx';

30 'xxx**xxx*xxxx'; and

'x***xxx***xxx*xxxx';

35 where x represents a numeric digit, * represents one character, and ** represents either one or two characters, all of which can only be equal to "-", ")
 ", ".", or ". ". There is a first character case that is omitted which is a "+" or a "(".

Van Hoff fails to recognize the problem of recognizing a telephone number, which, as disclosed by the Applicant, may include text, such as hyphens or parentheses, or spaces interspersed with numbers, may include one of many formats, such as
5 area codes, domestic or international formats. Furthermore, Van Hoff lacks any suggestion that the invention be modified to recognize a telephone number.

Applicant has therefore amended Claim 1 to more particularly point out that a telephone number contained within the parsed electronic document comprises a
10 plurality of numbers, and at least one text symbol interspersed with said numbers, to generally specify the structure of a telephone number. Applicant has also amended Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 9-14, to provide proper antecedent basis within the cited claim structure. Applicant submits that there is no new matter.

15 Applicant therefore submits that Claim 1, as amended, overcomes the Examiner's rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff. As Claims 4, 7, and 10-12 inherently contain the limitations of the claims they depend from, Applicant respectfully submits that they are patentable as well.

20 **3b.** As per claim 12, The Examiner stated that "Van Hoff does not explicitly teach parsing algorithm method. However, Van Hoff teaches recognizing pattern by parsing an electronic document. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that Van Hoff must include parsing algorithm which performs similar function as claimed".

25 The Applicant submits that Claim 12, which inherently contains the limitations of the Claim 4, is seen to be patentable as well.

30 In addition, as disclosed in the Application as filed, the parsing function is used to "pattern recognize a telephone number contained therein" (Claim 4 of the Application as filed), wherein, as cited in Claim 12, the parsing algorithm comprises the steps of:

35 "developing a set of Picture Formats for the patterns of phone numbers;
reading an accessed electronic document;

checking every character in the text of said electronic document to determine if it is a numeric character;

applying a pattern-recognition algorithm to sequentially check a character following an identified number to determine if said character is any of numeric or an

5 interspersed text or punctuation character;

caching a series of consecutive numbers; and

comparing said caches series to said Picture Formats;

wherein a matching format indicates a telephone number.

10 As discussed above, Van Hoff failed to recognize the mere existence of telephone numbers, commonly having different formats. It would therefore be unreasonable to assume that "Van Hoff must include parsing algorithm which performs similar function as claimed". The multiplicity of steps involved (e.g. developing a set of Picture Formats, caching series of consecutive numbers, comparing cached series to Picture
15 Formats, matching formats) for the patterns of phone numbers in the Applicant's parsing algorithm for "pattern recognizing a telephone number", as cited in Claim 12 in the Application as filed, would require undue experimentation to develop the cited method, which is neither taught nor suggested in Van Hoff, and the shear multiplicity of steps is too involved to be considered obvious.

20

4. The Examiner rejected Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9 and 13-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff (U.S. Patent No. 5,822,539) in view of Shachar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,736).

25 As discussed above, Van Hoff fails to disclose a method for the recognition of a phone number. Therefore, Applicant submits that independent Claim 1, as amended to clarify a typical structure for a telephone number, overcomes the Examiner's rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff. As Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 13-14 inherently contain the limitations of
30 the claims they depend from, Applicant respectfully submits that they are patentable as well.

4a-h. As per claim 2 and 13, the Examiner stated that "Shachar teaches transparently disconnecting from the session upon selection of the iconified telephone number and calling the telephone number". The Examiner also stated that "It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the method of iconifying telephone number taught by Van Hoff with dialing the telephone number taught by Shachar. The motivation for doing so would have been for a user to establish a telephonic session by clicking on the icon representing the telephone number".

5

Applicant disagrees. As disclosed in Shachar, col. 6, lines 1-14:

a "primary" data connection is established between the communication terminal device and a data communication network. Within the communication terminal device, a service information tag identifying a voice network address (e.g. a phone number) is provided. A service object, e.g. an icon or descriptive text, is displayed on the display of the communication terminal device. A user selects the device object with the input device. Upon selection of the service object, a voice connection is made to the voice network address. Information related to the primary data connection is saved, and the primary data connection is suspended. Once voice communications using the voice connection are completed, the voice connection is terminated and the primary data connection may be resumed/re-established".

10

15

20 Applicant submits that the "service information tag identifying a voice network address" is provided, and whereby a "service object" (an icon) is displayed on the display of the communication terminal device". Neither Van Hoff nor Shachar disclose the detailed recognition of a telephone number, or the production of a "service object" icon linked to a communication terminal device, based upon the

25 recognized telephone number.

While Shachar discloses basic transfer between a "data communication session" and a "voice communication session", Shachar is silent in regard to either the recognition of a phone number within an electronic document (e.g. a Web page), or the subsequent iconification of a recognized phone number to produce a "service object icon". Therefore, even in combination, Van Hoff and Shachar fail to meet the claims. It would be necessary to make modifications, not taught in either Van Hoff or Shachar, in order to combine the references in the manner suggested.

30

35 Specifically, as per Claim 15, neither Van Hoff nor Shachar "apply a parsing algorithm to the text of a Web page to pattern-recognize a telephone number

contained therein, nor do they add "representation coding to iconify the recognized telephone number". As per Claim 21, neither Van Hoff nor Shachar include a "parsing algorithm...to pattern-recognize a telephone number contained in the text of a Web page". As per claim 23, neither Van Hoff nor Shachar include a web 5 telephone for receiving and displaying a Web page having an iconified phone number. While Shachar includes a "service object icon" to switch between a "data communication session" and a "voice communication session", the service object icon is defined within an "electronic business card data structure", stored "within non-volatile memory of a communication terminal device" (specifically a computer or 10 screen phone) (col. 5, lines 37-44).

The Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, and 13-23 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 set forth in this Office Action.

15

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the Applicant considers the invention to be in condition for allowance. The Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of 20 Allowance is forwarded to the Applicant, and the present application is therefore allowed to issue as a United States patent.

Respectfully Submitted,

25


Michael A. Glenn
Attorney For Applicant
Reg. No. 30,176

30

125 Lake Road
Portola Valley, CA 94028
(650) 851-7138